



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/671,254

09/24/2003

Yuji Okamoto

59880 (70904)

8151

21874

7590

06/18/2009

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP

P.O. BOX 55874

BOSTON, MA 02205

EXAMINER

DHINGRA, PAWANDEEP

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/18/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/671,254	Applicant(s) OKAMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner PAWANDEEP S. DHINGRA	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- This action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment after non-final action filed on 3/24/2009.
- Claims 1-8 are pending.

Response to arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/24/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that cited references, in particular Ikegami fails to disclose "suspension of an invalidation/deletion being performed is permitted in response to a request of the suspension of the invalidation/deletion by entry of a predetermined code".

In reply, examiner asserts that Tokukaihei (Inoue Rieko) teaches suspension (stopping) of the invalidation (deletion) performed by the image data invalidating means (see figures 1-2) while the invalidation is being performed (see abstract, see figure 4, paragraphs 51-56, note that the request for stopping the deletion is made while the deletion process, S402-S404, is being performed in a repetitive manner). Tokukaihei further teaches permitting the suspension of the invalidation being performed, in response to a request of the suspension of the invalidation (see abstract, figure 4, paragraph 51-56, note that the deletion will be stopped in response to the request for stopping the deletion is made by the directing means, hence the request is being permitted, plus, request for stopping the deletion is made while the deletion process, S402-S404, is being performed in a repetitive manner). Tokukaihei further teaches a user (see paragraph 57) who requests the suspension of the invalidation (see

Art Unit: 2625

paragraphs 51-57), wherein the invalidation being performed cannot be suspended unless approved by the user requesting the suspension (see paragraphs 51-57, note the request for stopping the deletion is made by the user thus it is apparent that user approves or agrees to it), and thus allowing urgent data processing of a new job to be carried out (see paragraphs 51-57).

Ikegami teaches permitting a invalidation (S195, fig. 19), in response to a request of the invalidation (delete), after a predetermined code (password) is inputted to confirm that a user who requested the invalidation (delete) is a certified user (authorized user) (see abstract and figure 19 with text), wherein the invalidation cannot be performed unless approved by the certified user by entry of the predetermined code (see figure 19 with text), thus maintaining a security level (see abstract; figure 19; column 15, lines 30-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the printing apparatus as disclosed by Koakutsu to include image processing method as taught by Tokukaihei (Inoue Rieko), and image processing techniques with added security as taught by Ikegami and combine the step of suspending the deletion process in progress as taught by Tokukaihei with the step of requiring and entry of a password for permitting an interrupt process such as deletion process as taught by Ikegami *such that when user would like to suspend the deletion process being performed (in progress) (as taught by Tokukaihei), a correct password entry would be required (as taught by Ikegami which requires password entry to permit an interrupt process such as deletion process)* in order to add further security to deletion

Art Unit: 2625

process which allows only certain permitted users to carry out the deletion process and for the benefit of attaining satisfactory security for the image data stored in the memory as taught by Tokukaihei in abstract, and having a system in which “an individual other than a legitimate user is not allowed to perform maintenance on this personal box even if the personal box is one for which a password is not necessary when printing data from the box” as taught by Ikegami at column 1, lines 59-67. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Koakutsu, Tokukaihei (Rieko), and Ikegami to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Applicant further argues that in Ikegami “the deletion of the image data would require registering and setting in advance passwords for the respective pieces of image data (personal boxes). In contrast, independent claims 1 and 5 require entry of a predetermined code to confirm that a user requesting suspension of an invalidation is a certified user”.

In reply, examiner asserts personal box of Ikegami is a storage region assigned to an individual and has image data stored in it. Each personal box has a password associated with it. The user is required to enter a password upon requesting deletion of a particular personal box to confirm whether the user is authorized to delete the particular personal box. If password is correct only then process for deleting the personal box is carried out. Thus, it is determined whether the user is a certified user of the particular personal box authorized to carry out the deletion process. Hence, Ikegami teaches entry of a predetermined code (password) to confirm that a user requesting invalidation is a certified user for the particular personal box.

Applicant argues that Ikegami requires registering and setting of passwords in advance.

In reply, examiner asserts that present application as disclosed in claim 1 compares and confirms predetermined code entered by a user to see if he/she is a certified user. Thus, what does the present invention compares the predetermined code entered by a user with to confirm the certified status of a user, if the password or predetermined code for establishing certified status is not set in advance?

Applicant further argues that "even if the preset password for a personal box, as disclosed in Ikegami, is considered a "predetermined code," the password does not relate to the status of a user as a "certified user" as claimed. In other words, in Ikegami, the password relates to a personal box, and does not indicate the user's status as a "certified user".

In reply, examiner asserts Ikegami teaches that the user is required to enter a password and if password is correct only then process for deleting the personal box is carried out. Thus, it is determined whether the user is a certified user of the particular personal box authorized to carry out the deletion process for a particular box. Thus, Ikegami teaches entry of a predetermined code (password) to confirm that a user requesting invalidation is a certified user for the particular personal box.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., *"an invalidation/deletion process that is given priority over another process"*; not requiring registering and setting in advance passwords for the respective pieces of

Art Unit: 2625

image data) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Examiner Notes

Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Koakutsu et al., US 6,285,459 in view of Inoue Rieko et al. (referred as Tokukaihei in this document), JP 09-284572 further in view of Ikegami, US 6,745,334.

Re claim 1, Koakutsu et al. discloses an image processing device (see figure 1, element 3), comprising: image data inputting means (figure 1, receiving unit 2 of printer) for inputting image data (see abstract); image data storing means (see figure 2, elements ROM 22, RAM 23) for storing the image data inputted by the image data inputting means (see abstract, figure 2, column 3, line 54-column 4, line 55); image data processing means (see CPU 21, figure 2) for processing the image data stored in the image data storing means (see abstract, column 3, line 54-column 4, line 55); and image data invalidating means (i.e. erasure unit 6, fig. 1) for performing invalidation of the image data (i.e. erasure of image data) stored in the image data storing means (see abstract, column 3, line 54-column 4, line 55).

Koakutsu fails to explicitly disclose the image processing device further comprising: directing means for directing suspension of the invalidation performed by the image data invalidating means while the invalidation is being performed; and permitting means for permitting the suspension of the invalidation being performed, in response to a request of the suspension of the invalidation by the directing means, request of the suspension of the invalidation is permitted after a predetermined code is inputted to confirm that a user who requested the suspension of the invalidation is a certified user, wherein the invalidation being performed cannot be suspended unless approved by the certified user by entry of the predetermined code, thus maintaining a security level and allowing urgent data processing of a new job to be carried out.

However, Tokukaihei teaches directing means for directing suspension (stopping) of the invalidation (deletion) performed by the image data invalidating means (see figures 1-2) while the invalidation is being performed (see abstract, see figure 4, paragraphs 51-56, note that the request for stopping the deletion is made while the deletion process, S402-S404, is being performed in a repetitive manner). Tokukaihei further teaches permitting means for permitting the suspension of the invalidation being performed, in response to a request of the suspension of the invalidation by the directing means (see abstract, figure 4, paragraph 51-56, note that the deletion will be stopped in response to the request for stopping the deletion is made by the directing means, hence the request is being permitted, plus, request for stopping the deletion is made while the deletion process, S402-S404, is being performed in a repetitive manner). Tokukaihei further teaches a user (see paragraph 57) who requests the suspension of the invalidation (see paragraphs 51-57), wherein the invalidation being performed cannot be suspended unless approved by the user requesting the suspension (see paragraphs 51-57, note the request for stopping the deletion is made by the user thus it is apparent that user approves or agrees to it), and thus allowing urgent data processing of a new job to be carried out (see paragraphs 51-57).

Ikegami teaches permitting a invalidation (S195, fig. 19), in response to a request of the invalidation (delete) by directing means (by pressing delete key), after a predetermined code (password) is inputted to confirm that a user who requested the invalidation (delete) is a certified user (authorized user) (see abstract and figure 19 with text), wherein the invalidation cannot be performed unless approved by the certified

Art Unit: 2625

user by entry of the predetermined code (see figure 19 with text), thus maintaining a security level (see abstract; figure 19; column 15, lines 30-38).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the printing apparatus as disclosed by Koakutsu to include image processing method as taught by Tokukaihei (Inoue Rieko), and image processing techniques with added security as taught by Ikegami and combine the step of suspending the deletion process in progress as taught by Tokukaihei with the step of requiring and entry of a password for permitting an interrupt process such as deletion process as taught by Ikegami *such that when user would like to suspend the deletion process being performed (in progress) (as taught by Tokukaihei), a correct password entry would be required (as taught by Ikegami which requires password entry to permit an interrupt process such as deletion process)* in order to add further security to deletion process which allows only certain permitted users to carry out the deletion process and for the benefit of attaining satisfactory security for the image data stored in the memory as taught by Tokukaihei in abstract, and having a system in which “an individual other than a legitimate user is not allowed to perform maintenance on this personal box even if the personal box is one for which a password is not necessary when printing data from the box” as taught by Ikegami at column 1, lines 59-67. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Koakutsu, Tokukaihei (Rieko), and Ikegami to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Re claim 2, Koakutsu fails to explicitly disclose the image data invalidating means continues the invalidation until the suspension of the invalidation is permitted.

However, Tokukaihei teaches the image data invalidating (i.e. deleting) means continues the invalidation (i.e. deletion) until the suspension (i.e. stopping) of the invalidation (i.e. deletion) is permitted (see paragraph 55, note that the deletion will be stopped once the request for stopping the deletion is made, hence the request is being permitted).

Re claim 3, Koakutsu fails to disclose the permitting means permits the suspension of the invalidation after obtaining approval by an administrator who administers the image processing device.

Tokukaihei further teaches permitting means for permitting the suspension of the invalidation being performed, in response to a request of the suspension of the invalidation by the user (see abstract, paragraphs 51-56 and discussion of claim 1 above).

Ikegami teaches permitting a invalidation (S195, fig. 19) after obtaining approval (i.e. correct password) by an administrator (i.e. user) who administers the image-processing device (figure 6 shows image processing device) (see figure 19 with text).

Re claim 4, Koakutsu fails to disclose the permitting means permits the suspension of the invalidation by input of a key operator code.

Tokukaihei further teaches permitting means for permitting the suspension of the invalidation being performed, in response to a request of the suspension of the invalidation by the user (see abstract, paragraphs 51-56 and discussion of claim 1 above).

Ikegami teaches permitting a invalidation (S195, fig. 19) by input of a key operator code (i.e. correct password) (see figure 19 with text; abstract) (see figure 16 for password input).

Re claim 5, claim 5 recites identical features, as claim 1, except claim 5 is a method claim. Thus, arguments made for claim 1 are applicable for claim 5.

Re claim 6, Koakutsu fails to disclose the identification of the user who made the request of the invalidation is carried out by input of a key operator code.

However, Ikegami teaches the identification of the user (whether user is authorized or not) who made the request of the invalidation is carried out by input of a key operator code (i.e. password) (see figure 19 with text; abstract) (see also figure 16 for password input; column 15, lines 30-38).

3. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Koakutsu et al., US 6,285,459 in view of Inoue Rieko et al. (referred as Tokukaihei in this document), JP 09-284572 further in view of Ikegami, US 6,745,334 further in view of Neilsen, US 6,639,687 further in view of well known art.

Re claim 7, Koakutsu fails to explicitly disclose a display indicating that the invalidation of the image data is in progress.

However, Neilsen teaches a display (element 20, fig. 4a) indicating that the printing of the image data is in progress (see fig. 4a with text). Neilsen further teaches

Art Unit: 2625

displaying of progress indicator can be performed or indicated for multiple actions or executing tasks (see title and abstract).

However, Official Notice is taken to note that ability to indicate invalidation (deletion) of the image data (deleting of data) in progress on the display is notoriously well known and commonly used in the art. It would have been obvious to display the indication of invalidation of image data (deletion of printing or any other data, for instance, see S94, figure 8) in progress just like in case of print job as shown in fig. 4a, as one of many executing tasks in the system of Neilsen for the benefit of providing the user with increased flexibility and options.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the printing apparatus as disclosed by Koakutsu to include image processing method as taught by Tokukaihei (Inoue Rieko), and image processing techniques with added security as taught by Ikegami and progress indicating techniques of Neilsen such that when user would like to suspend the deletion process being performed (in progress) (as taught by Tokukaihei), a correct password entry would be required (as taught by Ikegami for deletion process) in order to add further security to deletion process for the benefit of attaining satisfactory security for the image data stored in the memory as taught by Tokukaihei in abstract, and having a system in which “an individual other than a legitimate user is not allowed to perform maintenance on this personal box even if the personal box is one for which a password is not necessary when printing data from the box” as taught by Ikegami at column 1, lines 59-67 and to obtain status on the execution of the executing operation as taught by Neilsen at col. 1,

lines 7-9. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Koakutsu, Tokukaihei (Rieko), Ikegami, Neilsen and well known art to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

Re claim 8, claim 8 recites identical features, as claim 7, except claim 8 is a method claim. Thus, arguments made for claim 7 are applicable for claim 8.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Neilsen teaches permitting means (see figure 11, element 138 or fig. 13, element 182) for permitting the suspension (cancel job, fig. 4a) of the print job being performed (see figures 4a & 13 with text) in response to a request of the suspension of the print job by directing means (cancel job button, fig. 4a), and thus allowing urgent data processing of a new job to be carried out (see figures 4a & 8-9 with text) (see also figures 13-14 with text).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2625

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAWANDEEP S. DHINGRA whose telephone number is (571)270-1231. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/

Application/Control Number: 10/671,254

Page 15

Art Unit: 2625

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625